UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,962	09/28/2001	Richard G. Rebh	FLOR-0147	5194

7590 07/21/2005

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP
ONE LIBERTY PLACE, 46TH FLOOR
1650 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER	
DINH, DUC Q	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2674	

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/965,962	REBH, RICHARD G.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DUC Q. DINH	2674	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 November 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-73* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-73* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/26/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownell (U. S. Patent No. 5,565,739) in view of Chien (U. S. Patent No. 5,775,016).

In reference to claim 1 Brownell discloses a multi-segmented electroluminescent lamp comprising: an electroluminescent display 8; a motion sensor 2, controller 54 (Fig. 6b) connected with the display; in addition, a control program is permanently stored within the internal ROM memory of microcontroller U5 and is executed from the beginning each time the microcontroller is turned on. The microcontroller is reset on each initial power up by capacitor C18 and resistor R15. The program within the ROM reads data stored in the EEPROM U6. The data within the EEPROM U6 provides information as to the illumination of the individual segments of lamp 56. Therefore, EEPROM U6 may be specifically programmed for a specific E.L. lamp 56 and changed with the lamp (Fig. 1, 6, col. 11, lines 10-20). Brownell discloses everything except an adhesive for adhering the display to a floor. Chien discloses a display using glue or double side tape for adhering the display on the floor as claimed.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the glue of Chien for adhering the display to the floor for providing a display system attracting the attention of persons passing the display.

In reference to claim 2, Brownell discloses sensor 12 in Fig. 2.

In reference to claim 3-5, refer to the rejection applied to claim 1 for the instructions from the memory. In addition, as shown in FIG. 6, the programmable power supply of FIG. 6 includes a DC power supply 50, an inverter 52 and a controller 54 for driving an eight segment electroluminescent lamp 56 in a predetermined sequence for animation affect.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6-9, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownell (U. S. Patent No. 5,565,739), Chien (U. S. Patent No. 5,775,016) as applied to 1 above and further in view Blotky et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,762,734), hereinafter Blotky.

In reference to claims 6-9, Brownell discloses the data instructions within the EEPROM U6 provides information as to the illumination of the individual segments of lamp 56. Blotkey

discloses the controller to illuminate the display in a first, second patterns when the sensor idle or when an interface switch is activated (see Fig. 5. and Col. 4, lines 1-59).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Blotky, i.e.: the method to display different patterns when the sensor or when an interface switch is activated, in the combination device of Brownell and Chien for selectively and dynamically showing a plurality of images to attract the attention of the customers use the products for advertising purposes (col. 1, lines 25-35).

In reference to claim 20, Blotky discloses the manual switch 56 as claimed.

5. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownell (U. S. Patent No. 5,565,739) in view of Chien (U. S. Patent No. 5,775,016) as applied in claim 1 and further in view of Ladd (U. S. Patent No. 4,912,457).

In reference to claim 10, Brownell, Chien do not disclose a speaker for broadcasting connecting to the controller and the memory comprising sounds in different patterns for the system. Ladd discloses a detector and message annunciator which detecting the presence of people and generating an audio message and/or video display directed to the person or persons whose presence is detected in Fig. 1 (col. 1, line 55 – col. 2 lines 27).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the sound system of Ladd in the device of Brownell and Blotky for additionally informing customers of additionally the advantages or features of a particular product on display (col. 1, lines 6-10).

In reference to claims 11-12, Ladd discloses announcements are stored in voice recorder and reproduction circuit 25 by input from microphone 27 or line input 29 based upon the position of switch 31. The audio signal from line input 29 or microphone 27 is input to automatic gain control 33 which provides an audio output for storage in voice recorder and reproduction circuit 25 (col. 2, 9-21). Message recording is flexible and provides a variety of message recording modes. In particular, switch 22 and function selector circuit 23 provide seven message modes as follows. Up to four messages may be recorded in four separate channels. Message 1 is selected by placing switch 22 in position 1. Similarly, message 2, 3 or 4 is selected by placing switch 22 in position 2, 3 or 4, respectively. When in playback mode, the channel or channels which are played is determined by the position of switch 22... (col. 4, lines 6 – 41).

6. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownell (U. S. Patent No. 5,565,739) in view of Chien (U. S. Patent No. 5,775,016), and further in view of Ladd (U. S. Patent No. 4,912,457) [as applied to claims 10-11] and Blotkey (U. S. Patent No. 6,762,734).

In reference to claims 13-14, Brownell, Chien and Ladd disclose everything except the interface switch for the system. Blotkey discloses the interface switch coupled to the controller to illuminate the display in a first, second patterns when the sensor idles or when an interface switch is activated (see Fig. 5. and Col. 4, lines 1-59).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Blotky, i.e.: the method to active different patterns when the sensor or when an interface switch is activated, in the combination device of Brownell and Chien

and Ladd for selectively and dynamically showing a plurality of sound messages to attract the attention of the customers use the products for advertising purposes (col. 1, lines 25-35).

7. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownell (U. S. Patent No. 5,565,730) in view of Chien (5,755,016), as applied to claim 1 and 20 above, and further in view Blotky (U. S. Patent No. 6,762,734) and Rutledge (U. S. Patent No. 5,831,593).

In reference to claim 21, Brownell, Chien and Blotky do not disclose the input device is a wireless device. Rutledge discloses a remote control used as input device to control the computer system and a display device as shown in Fig. 1.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to substitute the remote control of Rutledge for the manual switch 56 for the combined system of Brownell, Chien and Blotky as user's desired so that one can control the system in a distance.

8. Claims 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownell U. S. Patent No. 5,565,739) in view of, Chien (5,775,016), as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Larussa (U. S. Patent No. 6,318,868).

In reference to claim 15, Brownell, Chien do not disclose the aromatic unit communicating with the controller and the memory comprises aromatic instructions for emitting

the aroma from the unit. Larussa discloses a display system equipped with a means for directing an odor towards the image display in Fig. 9-10.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the means for directing the odor of Larussa in the combination device of Brownell Chien for providing a system not only utilizes the human audio and visual senses but also addresses the sense of smell because the human olfactory nerves provide inputs into the brain that are an important factor in determining whether an observer will accept or reject a three dimensional visual presentation as being real (col. 2, lines 51-60).

In reference to claims 16-17, Larussa discloses that it is also to be understood that computerized control system 344 may also be software driven and may, without user input, selectively show one product after another. Likewise, depending on the time of day or other factors, computerized control system 344 may direct the display of different products. For example, in the illustrated example of perfume bottles, the system may display informal, casual scents during the day, and more formal perfumes at night (col. 8, lines 24-36).

9. Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownell U. S. Patent No. 5,565,739) in view of, Chien (5,775,016), and further in view of Larussa (U. S. Patent No. 6,318,868) [as applied to claims 15-17] and Blotkey (U. S. Patent No. 6,762,734).

In reference to claims 13-14, Blotkey discloses the interface switch coupled to the controller to illuminate the display in a first, second patterns when the sensor idles or when an interface switch is activated (see Fig. 5. and Col. 4, lines 1-59).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Blotky, i.e.: the method to active different patterns when the sensor or when an interface switch is activated, in the combination device of Brownell and Chien and Larussa for selectively and dynamically showing a plurality of aroma to attract the attention of the customers use the products for advertising purposes (col. 1, lines 25-35).

10. Claims 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownell (U. S. Patent No. 5,565,739), in view Chien (U. S. Patent No. 5,775,016) and further in view of Blotky (U. S. Patent No. 6,762,734).

In reference to claim 22, refer to the rejection as applied to claim 1. Brownell and Chien disclose everything except the instructions for instructing the controller to illuminate the display in a first, second when the sensor senses or does not sense motion or display the third pattern when an interface switch is activated. Blotky discloses a method to display different patterns when the sensors idle (does not senses motion) or when an interface switch is activated (see Fig. 5. and Col. 4, lines 1-59).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Blotky, i.e.: method to display different patterns when the sensor or when an interface switch is activated, in the device combination of Brownell and Chien for selectively and dynamically showing a plurality of images to attract the attention of the customers use the products for advertising purposes (col. 1, lines 25-35).

In reference to claims 23-29, refer to the rejection as applied to claims 2-9.

11. Claims 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownell U. S. Patent No. 5,565,739) in view of Chien (5,775,016) and further in view of Blotky (U. S. Patent No. 6,762,734) [as applied to claims 22 above] and Ladd (U. S. Patent No. 4,912,457).

In reference to claims 30-32, Brownell, Chien and Blotky do not disclose a speaker for broadcasting connecting to the controller and the memory comprising sounds in different patterns for the system. Ladd discloses a detector and message annunciator which detecting the presence of people and generating an audio message and/or video display directed to the person or persons whose presence is detected in Fig. 1 (col. 1, line 55 – col. 2 lines 27).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the sound system of Ladd in the combination device of Brownell, Chien and Blotky for additionally informing customers of additionally the advantages or features of a particular product on display (col. 1, lines 6-10).

In reference to claims 33-44, Blotkey discloses the interface switch coupled to the controller to illuminate the display in a first, second patterns when the sensor idles or when an interface switch is activated (see Fig. 5. and Col. 4, lines 1-59).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Blotky, i.e.: the method to active different patterns when the sensor or when an interface switch is activated, in the combination device of Brownell and Chien Blotky and Ladd for selectively and dynamically showing a plurality of sound messages to

attract the attention of the customers use the products for advertising purposes (col. 1, lines 25-35).

12. Claims 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownell (U. S. Patent No. 5,565,739) in view of Chien (U. S. Patent No. 5,775,016) and further in view of Blotky (U. S. Patent No. 6,762,734). [as applied to claim 22] and Larussa (U. S. Patent No. 6,318,868).

In reference to claim 35, Brownell, Chien and Blotkey disclose everything except the aromatic unit communicating with the controller and the memory comprises aromatic instructions for emitting the aroma from the unit. Larussa discloses a display system equipped with a means for directing an odor towards the image display in Fig. 9-10.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the means for using the odor of Larussa in the combination device of Brownell Chien and Blotky for providing a system not only utilizes the human audio and visual senses but also addresses the sense of smell because the human olfactory nerves provide inputs into the brain that are an important factor in determining whether an observer will accept or reject a three dimensional visual presentation as being real (col. 2, lines 51-60).

In reference to claims 36-37, Larussa discloses that it is also to be understood that computerized control system 344 may also be software driven and may, without user input, selectively show one product after another. Likewise, depending on the time of day or other factors, computerized control system 344 may direct the display of different products. For

example, in the illustrated example of perfume bottles, the system may display informal, casual scents during the day, and more formal perfumes at night (col. 8, lines 24-36).

In reference to claims 38-39, Blotkey discloses the interface switch coupled to the controller to illuminate the display in a first, second patterns when the sensor idles or when an interface switch is activated (see Fig. 5. and Col. 4, lines 1-59).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Blotky, i.e.: the method to active different patterns of the of the device when the sensor or when an interface switch is activated, in the combination device of Brownell and Chien and Larussa for selectively and dynamically showing a plurality of aroma to attract the attention of the customers use the products for advertising purposes (col. 1, lines 25-35).

13. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownell (U. S. Patent No. 5,565,739) in view of Chien (U. S. Patent No. 5,775,016) and further in view of Rutledge (U. S. Patent No. 5,831,593).

In reference to claim 41, Brownell, Chien and Blotky do not disclose the input device is a wireless device. Rutledge discloses a remote control used as input device to control the computer system and a display device as shown in Fig

Claims 42-69 are method claims corresponding to the apparatus of claims 22-41,and therefore, rejected based on the same basis set forth in said claims.

14. Claim 70 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownell (U. S. Patent No. 5,565,739) in view of Chien (U. S. Patent No. 5,775,016), and further in view of Ladd (U. S. Patent No. 4,912,457).

In reference to claims 70, Brownell discloses a display system comprises a electroluminescent display, motion sensor 2, controller 54 (Fig. 6b) connected with the display; a control program is permanently stored within the internal ROM memory of microcontroller U5 and is executed from the beginning each time the microcontroller is turned on. The data within the EEPROM U6 provides information as to the illumination of the individual segments of lamp 56 for illuminating the display on the first pattern. Therefore, EEPROM U6 may be specifically programmed for a specific E.L. lamp 56 and changed with the lamp (Fig. 1, 6, col. 11, lines 10-20). Chien discloses a floor display using adhesive material for adhering the display on the floor.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the glue of Chien for adhering the display to the floor for providing a display attracting the attention of persons passing the display.

Brownell, Chien do not disclose a speaker for broadcasting connecting to the controller and the memory comprising sounds in different patterns for the system. Ladd discloses a detector and message annunciator which detecting the presence of people and generating an audio message and/or video display directed to the person or persons whose presence is detected in Fig. 1 (col. 1, line 55 – col. 2 lines 27).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the sound system of Ladd in the device of Brownell and Chien for

additionally informing customers of additionally the advantages or features of a particular product on display (col. 1, lines 6-10).

15. Claim 71 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownell (U. S. Patent No. 5,565,739) in view of Chien (U. S. Patent No. 5,775,016), and further in view of Ladd (U. S. Patent No. 4,912,457) [as applied to claim 70] and Larussa (U. S. Patent No. 6,318,868).

In reference to claim 71, Brownell, Chien and Ladd do not disclose the aromatic unit communicating with the controller and the memory comprises aromatic instructions for emitting the aroma from the unit. Larussa discloses a display system equipped with a means for directing an odor towards the image display in Fig. 9-10.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the means for directing the odor of Larussa in the combination device of Brownell, Chien and Ladd for providing a system not only utilizes the human audio and visual senses but also addresses the sense of smell (col. 2, lines 51-60).

16. Claims 72-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brownell (U. S. Patent No. 5,565,739) and Chien (U. S. Patent No. 5,775,016), in view of Ladd (U. S. Patent No. 4,912,475), and further in view of Larussa (U. S. Patent No. 6,318,868) [as applied to claims 70-71] and Blotky (U. S. Patent No. 6,762,734).

In reference to claims 72, Brownell and Chien, Ladd, and Larussa do not disclose an interface unit which electrical communication with the controller for instructing the controller to illuminate the display a second patterns on the electroluminescent display and to broadcast a first sound thought the speaker when an interface switch is activated. Blotky discloses a method to

display different patterns when the sensor idles or when an interface switch is activated (see Fig. 5. and Col. 4, lines 1-59).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Blotky, i.e.: method to display different patterns when the sensor or when an interface switch is activated, in the device of Brownell, Chien, Ladd and Larussa for selectively and dynamically showing a plurality of images and broadcast sound to attract the attention of the customers use the products for advertising purposes (col. 1, lines 25-35).

In reference to claims 73, Blotky discloses switch 56 as claimed.

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/12/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect argument to claims 1-21, 42, 22, 57, and 70 considering the newly added limitation of "electroluminescent floor display comprising an adhesive for adhering the display to a floor", see the newly discovered art of Chien teaching using an glue to adhering the display to the floor for providing a display attracting the attention of persons passing the display as applied to the independent claims above.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., Brownell fails to recognize the significant advertising advantages that can be achieved through floor advertising ...) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the

specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to learn the teaching of Blotky, i.e. method to display different patterns when the sensors or when an interface switch is activated, in the device of Brownell and Chien for selectively and dynamically showing a plurality of images to attract the attention of the customers use the products for advertising purposes (col. 1, lines 24-35 of Blotky); Ladd discloses a system that also it would have been obvious to use the broadcasting speaker system of Ladd having a message annunciator which detecting the presence of people and generating an audio message and/or video display directed to the person or persons whose presence is detected in Fig. 1 (col. 1, line 55 – col. 2 lines 27). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the sound system of Ladd in the system additionally informing customers of additionally the advantages or features of a particular product on display for advertising purpose (col. 1, lines 6-10 of Ladd). Furthermore, Larussa discloses a display system equipped with a means for directing an odor towards the image display in Fig. 9-10. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention was made to provide the means for directing the odor of Larussa for providing a advertising system not only utilizes the human audio and visual senses but also addresses the sense of smell because the human olfactory nerves provide inputs into the brain that are an important factor in determining whether an observer will accept or reject a three dimensional visual presentation as being real (col. 2, lines 51-60 of Larussa).

18. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **DUC Q. DINH** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7686** The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:00.AM-4:00.PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Edouard Patrick** can be reached on **(571)272-7603**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivery response should be brought to: Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, Va Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

DUC Q DINH
Examiner
Art Unit 2674

DQD
July 8, 2005

PATRICK N. EDOUARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER